



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SC
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,209	09/09/2003	Johan Louis Fehrensen		5710
37288	7590	01/04/2005		
LOUIS FEHRENSEN 2510 TORREY PINES RD. #215 LA JOLLA, CA 92037			EXAMINER PATTERSON, MARIE D	
			ART UNIT 3728	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/659,209	FEHRENSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Marie Patterson	Art Unit 3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no basis in the original specification for Velcro straps, buckles, removability of wedges, “plurality of sublayers”, or a hollow shoe covering as claimed.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the Velcro straps, buckles, removability of wedges, “plurality of sublayers”, or a hollow shoe covering as claimed must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement

Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 3, 11-14, 18, 26-29, 32, 40, 41, 45, 53, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3, 18, 32, and 45 the term "Velcro" is a trademark which is vague and indefinite since a trademark is not a definite structure.

In claims 11-14, 26-29, 40, 41, 53, and 54 the phrase "plurality of sublayers" is confusing, vague, and indefinite because it is not clear from the specification and drawings what structural limitations applicant intends to encompass with such language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 30, 35-43, and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (5345701).

Smith shows a "sandal" comprising an upper (1000), with multiple layers (shown in figure 10) and a wedge (1030A) or an upper (as is well known and conventional), a sole

upper layer (600) with a wedge (650) and lower layers (the inherent conventional insole/midsole/outsole) substantially as claimed except for exact angle of the wedge. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wedge with an angle of between 2 and 6 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

In reference to claims 40, 41, 53, and 54, making layers of shoes from "sublayers" or laminates (which is what the Examiner assumes applicant is referring to with such language) is extremely well known and conventional and it would have been obvious to make any of the layers of the device of Smith from a laminate to provide desired material flexibility, rigidity, cushioning, etc..

6. Claims 1-29, 31-34, and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Darby (2616190).

Smith shows footwear with a plurality of sole layers with a wedge element located between some of the layers substantially as claimed except for explicitly providing two layers above and below the wedge. Darby clearly teaches providing two layers above the wedge element (figure 8a). Smith clearly teaches and shows a conventional shoe with two outsole layers located below the wedge (figure 10). It would have been obvious to provide two layers above the wedge as taught by Darby in the footwear of Smith to increase foot comfort and cushioning.

In reference to claims 2-5, 17-20, 31-34, and 44-47, Darby clearly teaches providing wedge sole elements in all types of footwear including sandals, slippers, boots, and the like (see column 6 lines 24-25). Straps, Velcro straps, buckles, thong style, etc. are all well known and conventional types of sandals that would have been obvious alternative uppers for the footwear of Smith as modified by the teaching of Darby to use a wedged sole for a sandal type footwear.

In reference to claims 11-14 and 26-29, making layers of shoes from "sublayers" or laminates (which is what the Examiner assumes applicant is referring to with such language) is extremely well known and conventional and it would have been obvious to make any of the layers of the device of Smith from a laminate to provide desired material flexibility, rigidity, cushioning, etc..

1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (703) 872-9306 (**FORMAL FAXES ONLY**). Please identify Examiner Marie Patterson of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.



Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728